

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: *Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)*

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: *DOI-BLM-AZ-P020-2012-002-DNA*

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: *AZA-35600*

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: *GovNET – Communication Site Oatman Mountain*

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: *T. 4 S., R. 9 W., Section 25*

APPLICANT (if any): *GovNET Inc.*

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The applicant, GovNET Inc., is requesting a new authorization for communication site purposes. The “secure” site will be a low-power microwave relay station used to create an interoperable Public Safety and Emergency Systems network for all 15 Arizona counties, serving Department of Homeland Security mandates, AZ Office of the Courts, AZ DEMA (Emergency Operation Centers) and AZ National Guard connectivity. The ‘hub site’ will provide secure critical network services to four Counties (Yuma, Pima, La Paz, and Maricopa) for the SACCNET Project (State of Arizona Counties Communication Network) which is managed by the County Supervisors Association (CSA). The communication site will consist of a 4-leg self-supporting tower, 60-foot high with a 12-foot by 20-foot shelter directly underneath the tower structure adhering to federal security standards. Up to 6 antennas/dishes are required for this site. The site will consist of monitored 24/7 security cameras on the tower and shelter. Access will only be allowed to Government Agencies (City, County and Federal), who will be welcome to collocate for security and backup power. A propane tank will be required on the site. Fencing is requested. Unmanned use of the site will be year-round, with anticipated use being 30+ years. GovNET Inc., has proposed two site location options in which to place the communication site.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan
Date Approved/Amended: June 1988

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Lower Gila Resource Area processes a variety of land actions in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area - rights-of-way, communication sites, easements, permits, and unauthorized occupancy. All land cases would continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

EA No. AZ-020-98-078 (AZA-30640); NEPA # AZ-020-99-040 (AZA-30829)

Cultural Resources Report – BLM-020-11-79-14 (January 1979, Don Simonis, BLM Staff Archaeologist)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes. The proposed action is a feature of, or essentially the same as the alternative selected and analyzed in an existing document for Fisher Wireless (AZA-30640).

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes. A reasonable range of alternatives was analyzed in the existing document.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Yes. The existing analysis is valid in light of new information or circumstances because there has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

No. The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are not significantly different from those identified in the existing document.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes. Public involvement in the previous analysis provides appropriate coverage for the proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Fisher Wireless	Not Listed	Fisher Wireless
State of Arizona DPS	Not Listed	State of Arizona DPS
CellularOne	Not Listed	CellularOne
Yuma Cablevision Inc.	Not Listed	Yuma Cablevision Inc.
MCI	Not Listed	MCI
Arizona Public Service Co	Not Listed	Arizona Public Service Co
Maricopa Co Supervisors	Not Listed	Maricopa County Supervisors
All American Pipeline Co	Not Listed	All American Pipeline Co
US West Communications	Not Listed	US West Communications
Union Pacific RR	Not Listed	Union Pacific RR
Corps of Engineers	Not Listed	Corps of Engineers
Vitro Service Corp	Not Listed	Vitro Service Corp
INS	Not Listed	INS
DOE/WAPA	Not Listed	DOE/WAPA
J. David Horath	Wildlife Biologist	Bureau of Land Management
Cheryl Blanchard	Archaeologist	Bureau of Land Management

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents

CONCLUSION:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

// Jo Ann Goodlow

Jo Ann Goodlow, Realty Specialist

// Leah Baker

Leah Baker, Planning and Environmental Coordinator

<u>// Emily Garber</u>	<u>5/22/12</u>
Emily Garber, Lower Sonoran Field Manager	Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.